

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-19 and 46-55 are pending in this application.

Claims 14 and 20-45 have been canceled without prejudice.

New claims 46-55 have been added.

Regarding the § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Artzi in view of Ferguson.

Turning first to independent claim 1, Applicants have amended the claim to emphasize that for received classified advertisement text, that text is separately formatted for publication by at least two of a plurality of device types. Additionally, the separately formatted text is simultaneously displayed on a display for each of the at least two device types. A publication price for the classified advertisement as formatted is determined. The price is then also simultaneously displayed on the display in association with its correspondingly displayed separately formatted text.

The Examiner cites to Ben-Artzi as teaching the displaying of the formatted classified advertising text with respect to at least two devices. Applicants respectfully disagree. Ben-Artzi teaches the use of an editorial/layout station where given text (for example, an advertisement) is selected for publication (see, page 4, second full paragraph). The text is then assigned to a particular field on a page according to a selected template (see, page 4, second full paragraph). The result of this layout process for a single display type is shown in Figure 7A (this is the newspaper format). It will be noted that display is made by Ben-Artzi of the selected text with

respect to ONLY a SINGLE display type. Applicants claim, on the other hand, the separate formatting and simultaneous display of the text as separately formatted for at least TWO display types. In this way, the person handling editing/layout of the advertisement text can visually examine how the text, in separate formats, would layout for publication presentation as to MORE THAN ONE display type. There is no teaching or suggestion for such a functionality in Ben-Artzi. On the contrary, Ben-Artzi instead relies on sub-routine functionality associated with and executed by each potential display type device for receiving the singularly formatted text and then adapting that text at the destination host for presentation on the specific display type (see, page 4, second full paragraph). The results of the sub-routine operations for custom re-formatting and re-laying out the singularly formatted text for a specific display type are shown in FIGURE 7B (which illustrates how text originally formatted for a newspaper has been reformatted after communication to a PC for a computer printer – see, page 7, last paragraph). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention as recited in claim 1 distinguishes over the Ben-Artzi reference.

The Ferguson reference fails to address the deficiencies of Ben-Artzi. There is no teaching or suggestion in Ferguson for separately formatting received advertising text for multiple display types and then simultaneously displaying the separately formatted text with respect to at least two devices. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Ben-Artzi and Ferguson. Allowance of claim 1, along with its dependent claims, is respectfully requested.

Turning next to independent claim 9, Applicants claim a system wherein classified advertisement text is separately formatted for publication by at least two of a plurality of device types. A publication price for the classified advertisement, for each of the at least two device types, is also determined. The formatted text is simultaneously displayed as separately

formatted for each of the at least two device types and the determined publishing prices are also simultaneously displayed in association with its correspondingly displayed formatted text.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9, along with its dependent claims, is patentable over Ben-Artzi and Ferguson for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In independent claim 15, Applicants claim a graphical user interface (GUI) providing a user input interface to place a classified advertisement. A text area of the GUI is programmed to receive text for the classified advertisement. A plurality of text display areas are provided by the GUI on a single screen so as to simultaneously and separately display the received text for the classified advertisement in different publication formats. A plurality of price display areas are also provided by the GUI, wherein each of the price display areas is associated with a different text display area, and a price for publishing the advertisement based on the displayed publication format of the text is presented in the price display area.

Ben-Artzi fails to teach or suggest the claimed GUI. The Examiner's attention is directed to Figure 7A which illustrates the GUI of the editorial/layout station where given text (for example, an advertisement) is selected for publication (see, page 4, second full paragraph). As specifically noted by Ben-Artzi, the layout is performed with respect to a single output device (i.e., publication type). There is no simultaneous display of a certain piece of text in accordance with multiple publication formats. Instead, Ben-Artzi displays in a single format (see, Figure 7A) and uses meta-data or tags that allow for subsequent conversion of the singly formatted text into specific publication formats at the viewer/host end (see, page 4, second full paragraph and Figure 7B). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention as recited in claim 15 distinguishes over the Ben-Artzi reference.

The Ferguson reference fails to address the deficiencies of Ben-Artzi. There is no teaching or suggestion in Ferguson for a GUI which simultaneously and separately displays the

text in plural different publication formats. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is patentable over the combination of Ben-Artzi and Ferguson. Allowance of claim 15, along with its dependent claims, is respectfully requested.

Regarding the New Claims

With respect to new independent claim 46, it recites simultaneously displaying the classified advertisement text as separately formatted in both first and second publication formats. Claim 46 is accordingly patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as recited above.

Additionally, claim 46 further recites a communications system for communicating the first formatted classified advertisement to the first device type for publication thereby and for communicating the second formatted classified advertisement to the second device type for publication thereby. Ben-Artzi teaches a tagged generic formatting scheme where text and associated layout tags are generated with respect to certain information to be published. This data is then communicated over one or more networks to one or more different destination devices. At those destination devices (hosts), the tags are used by the device to format the associated certain information for publication (see, page 4, last two paragraphs). Thus, there is no first and second formatting as claimed, no separate display as claimed, and further no distinct first and second formatted communications as claimed. Claim 46 accordingly distinguishes over Ben-Artzi.

Turning now to dependent claim 50, Applicants claim that the first formatted classified advertisement is communicated to the first device type over a first communications channel and while the second formatted classified advertisement is communicated to the second device type over a second communications channel. Again, there is no teaching in Ben-Artzi for first and

second formatted classified advertisements. Instead, Ben-Artzi teaches a single format where the included tags assist each receiving device in formatting the included information for publication. Still further, Applicants claim that the composition system further formats the text of the classified advertisement in the first channel format for communication over the first communications channel and formats the text of the classified advertisement in the second channel format for communication over the second communications channel. In essence, the composition system engages in formatting which takes into account not only the device upon which the advertisement is going to be published but also the channel formatting needed in order to utilize a certain communications channel in order to reach that device. There is no teaching or suggestion for such an operation in connection with the Ben-Artzi process where multiple devices are concerned, but only a single type of formatting, which is compatible with both the communications channel and the device, is used.

New independent claim 51 is a method analog of system claim 46 and is believed to be patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that the pending application is in condition for favorable action and allowance.

Dated: 10/19/05

Respectfully submitted,

By

Andre M. Szuwalski

Registration No.: 35,701

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3700

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant